## RECEIVED

# Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20554

JUL 1 4 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of	)
End User Common Line	)

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

#### REPLY

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth") hereby submits its Reply to Comments filed in the above referenced proceeding.

On May 30, 1995, the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) inviting parties to comment on a number of issues involving the application of subscriber line charges (SLCs) to local loops used in the provision of Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN) and other services that permit the provision of multiple derived channels to a customers over a single facility.1 The comments filed in response to the NPRM provide the Commission with a clear view of the course it must take in this proceeding. In order to assure the continued development and deployment of ISDN services, the Commission must act now by adopting a rule whereby ISDN customers will be assessed a single SLC per service. Any other option would impede the development of this important new technology. Commission action on ISDN need not await a comprehensive review of subscriber line charges (SLCs) and other cost

No. of Copies rec'd  $0 \times 4$ List ABCDE

End User Common Line Charges, <u>Notice of Proposed</u>
Rule Making, CC Docket No. 95-72, Released May 30, 1995.

recovery mechanisms.

In the NPRM the Commission proposed several options for assessing SLCs to ISDN services: (1) one SLC per-facility; (2) one SLC per-derived channel; (3) SLCs based upon a ratio of average costs (4) a reduced number of SLCs accompanied by a small increase in SLC rates or a price cap adjustment to prevent a reduction in SLC revenues from causing an increase in Carrier Common Line (CCL) charges.

The Commission cautioned against adopting a solution that would create regulatory barriers to the development of beneficial new technologies such as ISDN. At the same time, the Commission stated that they would not issue rules which favored new technologies unless any difference in the regulatory treatment of new technologies and services had a sound public policy basis.<sup>2</sup>

Of the over thirty comments filed, the majority of the end user groups, information service providers and the Local Exchange Carriers (LECs) support the adoption of the single SLC per-facility (service) option.<sup>3</sup> In addition, the

Id. at  $\P$  9.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g., Comments of American Petroleum
Institute; David B. Banas; West Virginia University; Cable &
Wireless; America Online, GE Information Services, Inc., and
Prodigy; Center for Democracy and Technology; All Freight
Services; Time Warner Communications Holdings, Inc.;
Communications Managers Association; Information Technology
Industry Council; Siskiyou Telephone; Pacific Telesis;
NYNEX; Roseville Telephone; National Telephone Cooperative
Association; Rural Telephone Coalition; United States
Telephone Association; Southwestern Bell Telephone Company;
BellSouth; Rochester Telephone Corp; GTE; Microsoft.

comments provide the Commission with ample support that adoption of any other approach, such as application of SLCs based on a per-derived channel basis would be contrary to the public interest because it would seriously impede deployment of ISDN and delay the development of the National Information Infrastructure (NII).<sup>4</sup> Thus, adoption of the per-facility option is sound public policy based upon a strong public interest showing.

A few of the commenting parties urge the Commission to employ a cost based approach to assessing SLCs for ISDN. However, none of these comments present any compelling reason for the Commission to adopt such an approach at this time. The appropriate application of SLCs based on cost ratios and other cost factors must be determined as part of a far broader inquiry of access charge regulation. Numerous complex methodologies and policy issues surround such

 $<sup>^4</sup>$  GTE at 13.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g., US West, Texas PUC, California Bankers Clearing House Association et al.

On the other hand, as BellSouth stated in its Comments, the multichannel capability that the end users can obtain through ISDN are not derived through adding equipment to the loop facilities, but rather through different line cards that are part of the switch. The cost of that multichannel capability, then, is not allocated to the interstate jurisdiction as a nontraffic sensitive loop cost, nor should it be recovered through end user or carrier common line charges. Again, it must not be overlooked that the multichannel capability is paid for by the ISDN subscriber through the local charges for the ISDN service. When this fact is considered it can readily be seen that applying multiple SLCs to ISDN service leads to economic inequity.

approaches not the least of which would require the Commission to identify classes of services and/or users that would constitute appropriate groups for analysis. This rulemaking is not the appropriate forum for the Commission to engage in such an undertaking.

Finally, concerns raised by parties such as AT&T that adoption of the per-facility charge will immediately cause an increase in CCL charges are unwarranted. However, like Rochester, BellSouth would not object to a capping mechanism, such as the method proposed by the Commission, to ensure that CCL rates do not rise as a result of applying SLC's on per-service basis.

Oenter for Democracy and Technology, BellSouth, TIME Warner, USTA.

Rochester at 4 and NPRM at  $\P$  34.

For the forgoing reasons, BellSouth urges the Commission to act now on ISDN by adopting the per-facility charge option and defer further examination of SLCs and other issues involving the recovery of local loop costs to a comprehensive reform proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

By:

M. Robert Sutherland Richard M. Sbaratta

Its Attorneys

4300 Southern Bell Center 675 West Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, Georgia 30375 (404) 614-4894

DATE: July 14, 1995

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have this 14th day of July, 1995 served all parties to this action with a copy of the foregoing REPLY by placing a true and correct copy of the same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the parties listed on the attached service list.

Juanita H. Lee

### Service List CC Docket No. 95-72

\*Peggy Reitzel
Policy and Program Planning Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Room 544
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20554

David Cosson
L. Marie Guillory
National Telephone Cooperative Association
2626 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

George Petrutsas
Paul J. Feldman
James A. Casey
Roseville Telephone Company
Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C.
11th Floor, 1300 North 17th Street
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209

Michael J. Shortley, III Rochester Telephone Corp. 180 South Clinton Avenue Rochester, New York 14646

Mary McDermott
Linda Kent
Charles D. Cosson
United States Telephone Association
1401 H Street, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005

James T. Hannon U S West Communications, Inc. Suite 700 1020 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036

Jack Krumholtz
Law and Corporate Affairs Department
Microsoft Corporation
Suite 500
5335 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20015

Michael S. Pabian Ameritech Room 4H82 2000 West Ameritech Center Drive Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

David R. Poe Catherine P. McCarthy Time Warner Communications Holdings, Inc. LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene & MacRae L.L.P. 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20009

Matthew O'Brien
Andrew Stratford
CMA
Administrative Office
1201 Mt. Kemble Avenue
Morristown, NJ 07960-6628

Wayne V. Black, Esq.
C. Douglas Jarrett, Esq.
The American Petroleum Institute
Keller and Heckman
1001 G Street, N.W.
Suite 500 West
Washington, DC 20001

David B. Banas 4110 Gilpin Dr. Boulder, CO 80303

Jeffery S. Linder Cable & Wireless, Inc. Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006

Jim Lowers
Vice President
Siskiyou Telephone Company
P. O. Box 705
Fort Jones, CA 96032

James L. Wurtz Margaret E. Garber 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20004

Robert M. Lynch
Durward D. Dupre
J. Paul Walters, Jr.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company
One Bell Center
Room 3520
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Jeffery N. Fritz
Chair
National Information Infrastructure
Working Group
Telecommunications Engineer
West Virginia University
P. O. Box 6860
Morgantown, WV 26506-6860

Lucille M. Mates
Nancy C. Woolf
Timothy S. Dawson
Pacific Bell
Nevada Bell
140 New Montgomery Street
Room 1523
San Francisco, CA 94105

Gail L. Polivy GTE Service Corporation 1850 M Street, N. W. Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20036

Steven G. Sanders
President
Northern Arkansas Telephone Company, Inc.
301 East Main Street
Flippin, AR 72634

Mark C. Roseblum
Peter H. Jacoby
Seth S. Gross
AT&T Corp.
Room 3244J1
295 North Maple Avenue
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Thomas E. Taylor
Christopher J. Wilson
Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company
Frost & Jacobs
2500 PNC Center
201 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Christopher Bennett
Analyst
MCI Telecommunications Corporation
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Roy J. Cloutier 2734 West 35th Place Chicago, IL 60632-1608

John D. Bray 200 Bolinas Road, #38 Fairfax, CA 94930 Lawrence W. Katz
The Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies
1320 North Court House Road
Eighth Floor
Arlington, VA 22201

Jay C. Keithley
Leon M. Kestenbaum
Sprint Corporation
1850 M Street N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Neil S. Bucklew
Office of the President
West Virginia University
P. O. Box 6201
Morgantown, WV 26506-6201

Patrick Hennessy
7 Gates Circle
Hockessin, DE 19707

Ronald L. Plesser
Julie A. Garcia
Mark J. O'Connor
The Commercial Internet
Exchange Association
Piper & Marbury, L.L.P.
1200 19th Street, N.W., Seventh Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Stephen E. Nevas
Mary Lou Joseph
Donald Lockett
Michael Starling
Gregory A Lewis
National Public Radio, Inc.
635 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001-3753

James T. Hannon
U S West Communications, Inc.
Suite 700
1020 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Caressa D. Bennet Rural Telephone Coalition Law Offices of Caressa D. Bennet 1831 Ontario Place, N. W. Suite 200 Washington, DC 20009

Edward R. Wholl
Joseph Di Bella
NYNEX Telephone Companies
1300 I Street, N.W.
Suite 400 West
Washington, DC 20005

R. Michael Senkowski
Jeffrey S. Linder
Tele-Communications Association
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Jeanne Moran, Esq.
Tennessee Public Service Commission
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243

Bill Franklin All Freight Services 5311 Schneider Rd. Newburgh, IN 47630

Henry D. Levine
Ellen G. Block
California Bankers Clearing
House Association, MasterCard
International Inc., the New
York Clearing House Assoc.
and Securities Industry Assoc.
Levine, Blaszak, Block & Boothby
1300 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Daniel J. Weitzner
Deputy Director
The Center for Democracy and Technology
1001 G Street, NW
Suite 700 East
Washington, DC 20001

Randolph J. May
Brian T. Ashby
American Online Inc., Compuserve
Inc., GE Information Svcs., Inc.
and Prodigy Services Company
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004-2404

Rowland L. Curry, P.E. Director Telephone Utility Analysis Division Public Utility Commission of Texas 7800 Shoal Creek Boulevard Austin, Texas 78757-1098

\* VIA HAND DELIVERY